

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,040	01/29/2004	Osamu Tsuboi	011459A	2577
23850	7590 06/14/2005		EXAMINER	
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP			PRITCHETT, JOSHUA L	
1725 K STR SUITE 1000	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGT	WASHINGTON, DC 20006			
			DATE MAILED: 06/14/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/766,040	TSUBOI ET AL:	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joshua L. Pritchett	2872	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 A	April 2005.		
	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under the state of the state o			
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 19-29 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 19-29 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2004 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	e: a) accepted or b) objected or b)	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicationty documents have been receive nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	_	•	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D  5) Notice of Informal F  6) Other:		

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to Amendment filed April 29, 2005. Claims 19, 20 and 29 have been amended as requested by the applicant.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Behin (US 6,593,677) in view of McClelland (US 6,201,629) and McDonald (US 5,774,604).

Regarding claims 19 and 29, Behin teaches a micromirror unit comprising an inner frame (511), an electrode base (508), the frame provided with outwardly extending comb-teeth electrodes (505) and the electrode base provided with inwardly extending comb-teeth electrodes (506; Fig. 5); an outer frame (Fig. 5) surrounding the inner frame, the outer frame including a frame member (Fig. 5), a plurality of auxiliary portions (503, 504), at least one of the auxiliary portions with inwardly extending comb-teeth electrodes inerative with the outwardly extending comb-teeth electrodes of the inner frame (Fig. 5) at least another of the auxiliary portions being

Art Unit: 2872

electrically separate from the one auxiliary portion (col. 9 lines 52-55); a mirror forming base (509) interactive with the inwardly extending comb-teeth electrodes of the inner frame (Fig. 5); an inner torsion connection (510) connecting the frame body of the inner frame to the mirror forming base (Fig. 5); and an outer torsion connector (512) which connects the inner frame to the outer frame and defines an axis about which the inner frame and the mirror forming base are rotated relative to the outer frame (Fig. 5), the outer torsion connection having a width measured in the direction which is parallel to the mirror surface and perpendicular to the axis (Fig. 5); wherein the outer torsion connector comprises a plurality of torsion bars (Fig. 5), at least one of the torsion bars connecting the frame body of the inner frame to the frame member of the outer frame, at least another of the torsion bars connecting the electrode base of the inner frame to the auxiliary portion of the outer frame (Fig. 5). Behin lacks reference to the use of a mirror on the mirror forming base, but suggests the use of the apparatus in optical elements (abstract). Behin further lacks reference to the use of an insulating layer, but suggests electrical isolation of the components (col. 9 lines 52-55). Behin further lacks reference to the use of a torsion bar with a non-constant width. Behin further lacks a plurality of torsion bars on the same side of the inner frame. McClelland teaches the use of a mirror on the mirror forming base (4, Fig. 13B). McClelland teaches the use of an insulating layer (54) between the frame layer (55) and the electrode layer (56) in a micromirror unit (Fig. 13C). McDonald teaches a MEMS device with a torsion connector gradually becoming smaller from the inner frame (10) to the outer frame (Fig. 1b). McDonald further teaches a plurality of torsion bars on the same side of the frame (Fig. 1c) capable of providing two electrically separate conductive paths. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the Behin invention

Application/Control Number: 10/766,040

Art Unit: 2872

micromirror unit for use in an optical element, while maintaining electrical isolation of the various components of Behin and allowing the inner frame to rotate with a smaller amount of applied voltage. It would further have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the Behin invention include the torsion connectors of McDonald for the purpose of decreasing the amount of force required to pivot the mirror on the inner frame.

Regarding claim 20, Behin teaches the inner torsion connector defines an axis about which the mirror forming base is rotated relative to the inner frame (Fig. 5), the torsion connector having a width measured in a direction which is parallel to the mirror surface and perpendicular to the axis. Behin lacks reference to the torsion connector having a non-constant width.

McDonald teaches the torsion bar having a non-constant width wherein the torsion bar becomes gradually smaller from the inner frame toward the outer frame (Fig. 1c). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the Behin invention include the teachings of McDonald for the purpose of making the Behin mirror forming base rotate with a smaller amount of applied voltage.

Regarding claim 21, Behin teaches the axis of the inner torsion connector is perpendicular to the outer torsion connector (Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 22, Behin teaches the inner torsion connector includes a plurality of torsion bars (Fig. 5).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Behin teaches the invention as claimed but lacks reference to the use of a non-constant width torsion connector. McDonald teaches the torsion bar having a non-constant width wherein the torsion bar becomes monotonically becomes smaller from the

inner frame toward the outer frame (Fig. 1c). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the Behin invention include the teachings of McDonald for the purpose of making the Behin inner frame and mirror forming base rotate with a smaller amount of applied voltage.

Regarding claim 25, Behin teaches the inner torsion connector has on of a rectangular cross section, a circular cross section, and an elliptical cross section (Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 26, Behin teaches the invention as claimed but lacks reference to the torsion connector having a hollow structure. McDonald teaches the use of a torsion connector with a hollow structure (Figs. 1 b and c). The area between the two torsion bars shown in Figs. 1 b and c are hollow therefore the torsion connector which is comprises the two torsion bars is hollow. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the Behin invention include the teachings of McDonald for the purpose of making the Behin inner frame and mirror forming base rotate with a smaller amount of applied voltage.

Regarding claim 27, Behin teaches the invention as claimed but lacks reference to the use of a bifurcated torsion connector. McDonald teaches the use of a bifurcating portion in a torsion connector (Figs. 1 b and c). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the Behin invention include the teachings of McDonald for the purpose of making the Behin inner frame and mirror forming base rotate with a smaller amount of applied voltage.

Regarding claim 28, Behin teaches the invention as claimed but lacks reference to a curved connecting portion. McClelland teaches the torsion connector having a curved

connecting portion (Fig. 19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the Behin invention include the teachings of McClelland for the purpose of making the Behin inner frame rotate with a smaller amount of applied voltage.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Amendment, filed April 29, 205, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 19 and 29 under Behin in view of McClelland have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration of the newly amended claim limitations, a new ground(s) of rejection is made further in view of McDonald. The applicant argued that the Behin and McClelland reference failed to teach or suggest a torsion connector comprising a plurality of torsion bars connected to the same side of the inner frame capable of providing electrically separate conducting paths. The McDonald reference has been added to the rejection to teach the newly added claim limitations.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/766,040

Art Unit: 2872

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua L. Pritchett whose telephone number is 571-272-2318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 - 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew A. Dunn can be reached on 571-272-2312. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/766,040

Art Unit: 2872

JLP (

DREW A. DUNN
UDERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 8